

## ATTACHMENT 1

### Page 1

### **Instructions and Common Format for Administrative Structure Proposals in R.01-08-028**

These instructions and common format should be followed by parties submitting proposals in this proceeding on the administrative structure of energy efficiency programs. As directed by the Assigned Commissioner, proposals are due by April 8, 2004.

Please Note: All references below to the use of listings of (1) administrative functions/areas of responsibility and (2) criteria for evaluating administrative proposals refer to the most updated versions of Attachment 1 to the Assigned Commissioner's Ruling, dated February 6, 2004. The most recent versions of these listings are *attached to this ruling and posted at* [www.cpuc.ca.gov/static/industry/electric/energy+efficiency/rulemaking/index.htm](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/static/industry/electric/energy+efficiency/rulemaking/index.htm).

Each proposal should be organized as indicated below. *Sections I-VII are required. Section VIII is optional. Please note the page limits indicated in Section IX.*

Parties proposing similar structures are encouraged to collaborate in developing their submittals so that all of the required sections are presented for each proposal. Each party should sponsor only *one* proposal on administrative structure in the April 8 filing (either as a participant in a joint proposal with other parties, or as an individual sponsor of a proposal).<sup>1</sup> This does not preclude any party (whether sponsoring a proposal on April 8, or not) from commenting on any or all of the April 8 filings, and indicating at that time if there are other proposals that they would support in part or in whole.

**I. Administrative Structure Name**—Please give your proposal a name that helps summarize its key features.

**II. Summary of the Proposal**—Please prepare two or three paragraphs that both describe the proposal and discuss its strengths in meeting some or all of the criteria for evaluating administrative proposals.

**III. Overview of the Organizations in the Administrative Structure**—Please describe each organization that will be involved in the administrative structure. Include an organizational chart that identifies the key organizations in the proposed structure and illustrates how they report to each other. Your written description and organizational chart should provide us with a clear understanding of how the

---

<sup>1</sup> However, as noted in Attachment 3 under “implementation considerations”, if statutory changes are required to implement your proposed administrative structure, you should also present an alternate.

## ATTACHMENT 1

### Page 2

organizations would work together to plan, manage and evaluate energy efficiency programs.

#### **IV. Responsible Organizations for the Major functions in the Structure**

As discussed at the workshop, you are required to describe how each of the functions 1-9 presented in Attachment 2 will be performed. However, for those parties who only want to focus on EM&V-related functions, you may limit your proposal to functions #2, #6 and #7—provided that you clearly describe the flow of information and feedback to portfolio managers and implementers.

*No other partial proposals will be accepted.*

Please note: The Commission is not addressing the issue of what entities are to perform the “program implementer” functions (#10) in this phase of the proceeding. Therefore, your administrative structure proposals should not cover this function.

Your description should be complete, addressing each listed function (1-9 for proposals that address all administrative functions, 2, 6 and 7 for proposals addressing only the EM&V-related functions.) Your description should clearly list the organization(s) that would be responsible for completing these functions.

**V. Match with Selection Criteria**—Please describe how your proposed structure addresses each of the listed evaluation criteria in Attachment 3. If you do not believe that a particular criterion is applicable to your proposal or important for the Commission to consider in evaluating proposals, please provide an explanation and enter “not applicable” (“NA”) next to the criteria listing. However, please list all of the criteria even if you choose to enter “NA”. Make sure to cover *each of the sub-sections* under the evaluation criteria listings.

**Example Write-up for Evaluation Criteria:** (Note: these examples represent a selection of the listed criteria for illustrative purposes. In your proposals, you should list *each* of the criteria and respond accordingly.

1. **Promotes Integrated Resource Planning and Energy Efficiency Goals**—  
How does the proposed structure provide the following:
  - a. Capability of administering a portfolio of cost-effective energy efficiency programs that can meet the Energy Action Plan resource goals, Commission goals for per capita reductions in energy use and resource adequacy requirements--*This structure provides the capability to meet these goals and requirements by...(continue up to two paragraphs).*

## ATTACHMENT 1

### Page 3

#### 2. Organizational Focus and Mission:

- a. Are there any conflicts based on the agency(s) organizational focus and mission? *NA—This criterion is non-applicable to the proposed structure because... (elaborate)*

#### 3. Administrative Effectiveness—How does the proposed structure consider and ensure the following:

- a. Collaborative process and involvement of stakeholders, e.g., consumer groups, trade allies, manufacturers, retailers, publicly owned utilities and contractors--*The proposed structure ensures a collaborative process and involvement of these entities by... (continue up to two paragraphs).*

#### 4. Implementation Considerations—*This section of the listed criteria poses several questions to be addressed, including: What are the startup and ongoing costs of the organization? What legislation, if any, is required to implement the proposed administrative structure? Responses should be as complete as possible*

**VI. Summary**—In this section please explain the principal reasons why your proposed administrative structure should be adopted.

**VII. Legal Analysis**—As discussed in the Assigned Commissioner's Ruling dated February 6, 2004, parties are required to append legal analysis or briefs to their proposal to support their views on the legal requirements of their recommended proposal(s), particularly with structures that have required statutory changes in other states. In addition, you are required to explain how your administrative proposal is consistent with the statutory requirements concerning community choice aggregation under Assembly Bill 117.

**VIII. Comparative Analysis (Optional)**—This optional section of the submittal would compare and contrast the proposed structure with one or more alternatives described at the March 17 and 18, 2004 workshops. However, this section must also be complete by (1) presenting a description of each alternative per Sections II, Sections III and IV above, (2) addressing each of the listed evaluation criteria per Section V and (3) providing legal analysis of the legal requirements of the alternatives considered, per Section VII.

#### **IX. Page Limits.**

The April 8, 2004 filing may not exceed 35 pages (single-sided) for Sections I through VII above. Parties that include section VIII (comparative analysis) may

**ATTACHMENT 1**

**Page 4**

submit up to 50 pages. The form and size of the document must comply with Rule 2 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Below are suggested page limits, per section:

Sections I and II: 1 pages

Section III and IV: 10 pages

Section V: 15 pages

Section VI: 2 pages

Section VII: 7 pages

Section VIII (Optional): 15 pages

## Page 5

**(END OF ATTACHMENT 1)**

